

V. Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

The information on existing and future transportation and land use conditions was used to establish a Purpose and Need statement and a set of corridor goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria that will be used to guide future management actions regarding the corridor.

Purpose and Need

Purpose

The purpose of the US 89 transportation corridor between the Utah state line and the city of Montpelier, Idaho is to function as a transportation facility for current and future travel demands. This segment of US 89 is part of a major route that stretches from Mexico to Canada. Demands on US 89 include serving the needs of travelers who use the corridor for long-distance through-travel; serving the transportation needs of residents and communities along and near the corridor that rely on the corridor for local and regional commuting to and from jobs, shopping, schools and other routine activities; and serving the needs of an increasing number of people who come to the area to recreate. In travel-demand terms this comprises three types of trips:

- Internal trips, such as trips between the cities of Paris and Montpelier;
- Internal-external and external-internal trips, such as the large number of trips between locations in the state of Utah and the Bear Lake area in the south part of the corridor; and
- Through trips, which are an important component of travel along US 89, since it is a major multi-state recreational route.

The purpose of the corridor plan was to determine existing and future needs, identify and analyze alternate management practices and project improvements, establish corridor goals and objectives, and to adopt recommended management strategies and improvements for all transportation modes in order to address the identified existing and future transportation needs that were forecasted to develop in the next 20-year time period

Need

Existing annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes were found to range from roughly 1,000 to 8,500 vehicles per day (vpd) along the corridor. Because of the large component

Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

of recreational traffic carried on US 89 during the summer months, substantial seasonal variation in average daily traffic volumes was observed and measured. This variation ranged from volumes three times higher in the summer than the winter near Paris to six times higher just south of the Fish Haven area in Utah. Forecasts of future traffic growth along the corridor were projected to be the highest in the Bear Lake area, located in the southern segment of the corridor, where volumes were forecasted to roughly double by 2025.

The need for this corridor plan is based on the expected growth, and the requirement to plan for its orderly accommodation in all modes of transportation.

Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

The goals describe, in broad terms, desired outcomes to be achieved in implementing the corridor plan. For each goal, there are related objectives which define more specifically how the goals are to be accomplished.

Evaluation criteria related to the goals and objectives were also established for use in screening the management strategy and improvement options to be developed. The criteria provide a means for estimating how well a particular option will do in meeting the goals and objectives relative to other options. Not all of the criteria are relevant for each option, however; for example, an roadway improvement designed to increase the level of service may not be directly related to an access management objective.

Review and comment on the goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria presented below were provided by the ITD Management Team, the Task Force and TAC, and members of the public.

GOAL I. MAINTAIN MOBILITY

Objective 1. Minimize congestion and travel delay.

Evaluation Criteria 1. LOS

Evaluation Criteria 2. Travel time or vehicle hours of travel (VHT).

Evaluation Criteria 3. Reduction in number of roadway segments and locations with traffic operations needs.

Objective 2. Facilitate freight movement through the design of facility improvements, highway access, and adjacent land uses.

Objective 3. Provide convenient linkages between transportation modes.

Objective 4. Maximize connectivity and directness of travel.

Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

- Objective 5. Maintain travel reliability.
- Objective 6. Consider impacts to the transportation system when reviewing land use plan amendments, rezones, and development proposals.

GOAL II. ENHANCE SAFETY

- Objective 1. Design corridor transportation facilities to serve anticipated function and intended uses.
- Objective 2. Enhance safety by prioritizing and mitigating existing or potential high accident locations within the corridor.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Reduction in number of documented and potential high accident segments and locations.

- Objective 3. Develop parallel pedestrian and bicycle routes that comply with ITD design standards where these facilities cannot reasonably be provided on US 89.
- Objective 4. Work toward achieving and maintaining the current access management standards for US 89, consistent with ITD requirements, to reduce conflicts between vehicles and trucks and between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Reduction in public and private access points.

- Objective 5. Provide (by developer) safe vehicular and pedestrian access to and from new development and US 89.

GOAL III. ENHANCE LIVABILITY

- Objective 1. Protect and enhance the natural environment by avoiding or minimizing potential adverse impacts associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of acres of wetlands or wildlife habitat disturbed or lost.

- Objective 2. Avoid or minimize land use displacements associated with transportation system development.

Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of potential displaced/encroached upon parcels by land use type.

Objective 3. Avoid or minimize impacts to historic, cultural, and institutional resources associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Number of potential impacted parcels by type (direct/indirect) and degree of impact.

Objective 4. Avoid or minimize right-of-way needs associated with transportation system development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Right-of-way needs by land use type.

Objective 5. Promote transportation choices through the development of safe, attractive, and accessible pedestrian ways, bicycle ways, and multi-use pathways according to ITD requirements.

Objective 6. Encourage mixed-use development to minimize vehicular trip generation, particularly in the Bear Lake area.

GOAL IV. MINIMIZE COST

Objective 1. Minimize capital cost of transportation facilities, including preservation of rights-of-way prior to project development.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Estimated capital cost

Objective 2. Minimize transportation system user cost.

Evaluation Criteria 1. Travel time or vehicle hours of travel (VHT)

GOAL V. DISTRIBUTE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS EQUITABLY

Objective 1. Develop transportation facilities which are accessible to all members of the community. In particular, construct facilities to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Objective 2. Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse effects of transportation system development on minority populations and low-income populations.